

**REMARKS**

Claims 2-10, and amended claims 1 and 11 are in this application.

Claim 11 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. In explaining this rejection, the Examiner stated that the statement "each said projection screen . . ." is confusing.

It is respectfully submitted that such portion of claim 11 is not confusing. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the above 112 rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 1-7 and 11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by JP 3-106298.

Amended independent claim 1 now recites in part the following:

"a plurality of cabinets arranged within the frame such that each cabinet in the frame has a number of side walls and a back wall and an opening portion in front thereof so as to form a respective cabinet which is substantially enclosed on all but one side."  
(Emphasis added.)

It is respectfully submitted that JP3-106298 (hereinafter, the '298 patent) as applied by the Examiner does not appear to disclose the above features of claim 1. That is, in explaining the above 102 rejection with regard to claim 1, the Examiner appears to rely on Fig. 1b of the '298 patent for disclosing the above features of claim 1. It is respectfully submitted that such portion of the '298 patent does not appear to disclose that "each cabinet in the frame . . . has a back wall . . . so as to form a respective cabinet which is

substantially enclosed on all but one side. Instead, as shown in Fig. 1b of the '298 patent, several of the cabinets appear to not have a back wall and to have an opening on the back and the front thereof. The lack of a back wall for some of the cabinets in Fig. 1b of the '298 patent appears to be acknowledged by the Examiner. In support thereof, reference is made to lines 8-9 of section 8 on page 5 of the present Office Action.

Accordingly, for at least the above reasons, it is respectfully submitted that the above 102 rejection of claim 1 be withdrawn. For reasons similar to or somewhat similar to those previously described with regard to claim 1, it is also respectfully submitted that the above 102 rejection of claim 11 be withdrawn.

Claims 2-7 are dependent from independent claim 1. As such, it is respectfully submitted that the above 102 rejection of claim 2-7 be withdrawn.

Claim 8 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over patent '298 in view of JP 5-199576 A.

Claim 8 is dependent from independent claim 1. The Examiner does not appear to have relied on JP 5-199576 A to overcome the above-described deficiencies of the '298 patent. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the above 103 rejection of claim 8 be withdrawn.

Claims 8-10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over patent '298 in view of JP 5-244550 A.

Claims 8-10 are dependent from independent claim 1. The Examiner does not appear to have relied on JP 5-244550 A to overcome the above-described deficiencies of the '298 patent. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the above 103 rejection of claims 8-10 be withdrawn.


In view of the above, each of the presently pending

claims in this application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the outstanding rejections of the claims and to pass this application to issue. If, however, for any reason the Examiner does not believe that such action can be taken at this time, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone applicant's attorney at (908) 654-5000 in order to overcome any additional rejections and/or objections which the Examiner might have.

If there are any additional charges in connection with this requested amendment, the Examiner is authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 12-1095 therefor.

Dated: January 24, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

By   
Dennis M. Smid, Esq.  
Registration No.: 34,930  
LERNER, DAVID, LITTENBERG,  
KRUMHOLZ & MENTLIK, LLP  
600 South Avenue West  
Westfield, New Jersey 07090  
(908) 654-5000  
Attorney for Applicant